

eaten entire shell and all."

The future historian of the Tract Society will have occasion, we have no doubt to record that they come out of this furnace "upon whose bodies the fire had no power; nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them."

Ancient Millerism.

The Millerism of our day, has had three different forms. The first may be called the '43 form; the second, the 7th month form; and the third, the to-day form. Mr. Miller himself is at present in the third form. In a letter of Nov. 10th, he says:

"I have fixed my mind upon another time, and here I mean to stand until God gives me more light. And that is *To-day*, *To-day*, *To-day*, until he comes, and I am His for whom my soul yearns."

His third form comes nearer the ancient Millerism, than either of the preceding forms. But where did the ancient Millerism prevail? Who embraced it? What occasioned their mistake? By whom were they opposed? and with what spirit? and in what way?

Jerusalem, whose site was then within the Roman empire, now within the Turkish dominions, now called Salonica, then Thessalonica.

But who embraced the ancient Millerism? They were members of a Christian church, and apparently good men. What then occasioned their mistake? Misapprehension of truth. Paul had preached among them, but they misapprehended his preaching. He had written to them a tender, wise, and inspired letter; but they misapprehended a portion of its contents. He had taught them to look for a spiritual religion stirring within them; but they had misapprehended these various instructions. They fell under the mistake of a very sincere impression that "the day of Christ was then at hand." 2 Thes. 2: 2.

But by whom were these ancient Millerites opposed? By the inspired apostle Paul. And with what spirit? With a spirit of moderation and kindness. And in what way? By a plain, kind, and faithful declaration of the truth. He told them not to be shaken in mind, nor troubled, neither by any spiritual impulses stirring within them, nor by the word which he had preached to them, nor by any thing in the letter he had previously written to them. He says, "Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." It should be observed, that Paul, while opposing those who had fixed a present date, was equally careful not to fix a future date. He left the date where it was evidently the purpose of God to leave it, among the things unrevealed.

COTTAGE BIBLE.—See an article on the first page. The agent, now in this city, is Dea. GRANGER of Suffield, Ct. Parents will find this an excellent work to help them in a preparation to act as the guide of their children in their Sabbath School lessons—and teachers of Sabbath Schools will find it a very valuable companion.

"There is nothing new to be said about the College—every thing goes on finely. There is a great deal of hard study done there."

There is in Ohio a Baptist Association of colored churches. They held their anniversary in Brown county, in September. Churches 14; ordained ministers, 9; members 950. They hold no communion, fellowship, or correspondence with any Baptist church or churches, associations, conventions or societies, the policy of which is not to preach, pray, and act against slavery in every sense. They sustain one domestic missionary. The Cross & Journal says this body embraces nearly all the colored churches in that State.

REVIVALS.

Bro. Swain writes from Brentwood to the N. H. Baptist Register—"Our Ministers' meeting was rather interesting. Bro. Haley remained till Friday, and we had some solemn and interesting meetings; 15 have recently indulged hope. I have baptized six. The Lord is with us. The prospect is more encouraging than any revival that I have ever enjoyed in the present month."

In the Biblical Recorder, G. M. Thompson reports the recent baptism of 56 in five different places in North Carolina.

The Alabama Baptist at Marion, states that 23 individuals were baptized at that place on Sunday, Nov. 19—one of them an assistant teacher in the Judson Institute; another the wife of the Principal, and fourteen of them young ladies, pupils in the Institute.

Dr. Wayland to Dr. Fuller.

LETTER IV.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—In my last two letters I have attempted to show what I mean when I assert that slavery is a moral evil. I have wished to make it clear that slavery, or the holding of men in bondage, and obliging them to labor for our benefit, without their contract or consent, is always and every where, or as you well express it, *semper et ubique*, a moral wrong, a violation of the obligations under which we are created to our fellow-men, and a transgression of the law of our Creator, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*; that, however, while this is true, it is also true that the guilt of any individual doing this wrong may be modified by his means of obtaining a knowledge of his duty, and also by the laws of the community of which he may chance to be a member.

The objection to this view of the subject is founded on the precept and example of the Old and New Testaments. With pleasure I proceed to consider the argument on this part of the question. Believing as we both do that the Bible is a perfect rule of duty, if we can ascertain what it teaches, we may reasonably hope that our opinions may yet coincide. In this letter I propose to examine the argument derived from the Old Testament alone.

Your view, I think, may be briefly expressed as follows: Slavery was sanctioned in the Old Testament; and, since the Old Testament is a revelation from God, and since He would not sanction any thing morally evil, therefore slavery is not a moral evil.

Before, however, I proceed to consider this argument, permit me to remark, that I do not perceive in the views which I have expressed any thing at variance with the teachings of the Old Testament. I will

now proceed to state briefly thus: A revelation among fore sanctioned to

Let us reduce this and it will be expressed

1. Whatever God sanctions, He sanctions Hebrews, He sanctions

2. God sanctions Hebrews. There

3. God sanctions at all times.

I believe that in argument correctly because I do not know exactly.

Let us, then, in the major premises stated among the all men and at all

Now this proposition is evident. If it be true by reason, or by revelation, it could be supporting

1. Whatever God

2. The Hebrew

3. Whatever I

Now I think it

with the whole the nation. Every one

has seen fit to enlighten; and that he

portions in different given us the light of

present day have from revelation which this light

judged. They will for the transgression light has discovered

their transgression laid to their account the world, these tra

to them. But I ask us? Could we who

pel, go back to the of, Aristotle or Co what the light of

allowable in us? Y position would lead

elusion.

The same principle gradual revelations has at different per

He increased the direct communication will. A large part

saw fit to withhold. latter part he did n

trary he allowed th that is, in this sen

But could any of u back to the patriarch

for our moral rule the revelation, ma

So of the Mosai revelation the light ed, but still much

cannot plead in th other, that what w

buke in a darker, whom greater light

pos, therefore, th the proposition in q

reveals his will in ferent times, and t same time; that h

for precisely as mu them; that he allo

actions on the mor light has not shine

sanctions them; b never be pleaded i

joy a more perfe whom a better lig

But suppose we